



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

JGJR.: 05-06

Paper No: \_\_\_\_

DELTAT GMBH  
KERKRADER STRASSE 11  
HESSEN 35394 DE GERMANY

**COPY MAILED**  
**JUN 05 2006**  
**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of	:	
Nehring, et al.	:	DECISION
Application No.: 10/022,406	:	
Filing Date: 20 December, 2001	:	
Attorney Docket No. (None)	:	

This is a decision on the petition filed on 6 and 7 April, 2006, to revive the instant application under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) as having as abandoned due to unintentional delay as a request for the withdrawal of the holding of abandonment been abandoned due to unintentional delay.

For the reasons set forth below the petition as considered under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **DISMISSED**.

**NOTES:**

- (1) Any petition (and fee) for reconsideration of this decision must be submitted within two (2) months from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a)."

(It is noted, however, that Petitioner may be unable to present a satisfactory showing to support a petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a), and Petitioner's only alternative will be to file a petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b).)

- (2) Thereafter, there will be no further reconsideration of this matter.

### BACKGROUND

The record reflects that:

- Petitioner failed to reply timely and properly to a non-final Office action mailed on 23 June, 2004, with reply due absent extension of time on or before 23 September, 2004—a copy is enclosed for Petitioner's review;
- the application went abandoned after midnight 23 September, 2004;
- the Office mailed a Notice of Abandonment, indicating a failure to respond to the 23 June, 2004, Office action, on 20 May, 2005;
- Petitioner averred in the original petition that the reason for the abandonment was that the Office had failed to process a payment from Petitioner to the Office—while it is true that the Office has not processed the addition payment, and Petitioner must resubmit the payment/authorization along with that for any renewed petition, the focus at this point also is Petitioner's failure to reply timely and properly to the 23 June, 2004, Office action, and the petition was dismissed on 10 February, 2006;
- the instant application avers unintentional delay—the requirements of which are petition, fee, reply, statement/showing of unintentional delay, and—where appropriate—a terminal disclaimer and fee.

Petitioner appears not to be reading correctly the fee schedule on the Office website ([www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov) , <http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/ac/qs/ope/fee2006may15.htm> ) and has not paid the proper petition fee (at this writing \$750.00 or \$1,500.00, however, Petitioner always should review the website for updates).

Petitioner has not satisfied the fee requirement.

Petitioner's filings suggest a lack of familiarity with practice before the Office.

Petitioner should review the Office website for discussion the matter in the commentary at MPEP §711.03(c):

[http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/mpep/documents/0700\\_711\\_03\\_c.htm#sect711.03c](http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/mpep/documents/0700_711_03_c.htm#sect711.03c)

### STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the

satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).<sup>1</sup>

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application under this congressional grant of authority. The language of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is clear, unambiguous, and without qualification: the delay in tendering the reply to the outstanding Office action, as well as filing the first petition seeking revival, must have been unavoidable for the reply now to be accepted on petition.<sup>2</sup>

Delays in responding properly raise the question whether delays are unavoidable.<sup>3</sup> Where there is a question whether the delay was unavoidable, Petitioners must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a).<sup>4</sup> And the Petitioner must be diligent in attending to the matter.<sup>5</sup> Failure to do so does not constitute the care required under Pratt, and so cannot satisfy the test for diligence and due care.

(By contrast, unintentional delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, and also, by definition, are not intentional.<sup>6</sup>))

#### Allegations as to Unintentional Delay

The regulatory requirements of a petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) are the petition, fee, reply, statement/showing of unintentional delay, and—where appropriate—a terminal disclaimer and fee.

Petitioner has not satisfied the petition fee requirement.

---

<sup>1</sup> 35 U.S.C. §133 provides:  
**35 U.S.C. §133 Time for prosecuting application.**  
Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Commissioner in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such delay was unavoidable.

<sup>2</sup> Therefore, by example, an unavoidable delay in the payment of the Filing Fee might occur if a reply is shipped by the US Postal Service, but due to catastrophic accident, the delivery is not made.

<sup>3</sup> See: *Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice*, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53158-59 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 86-87 (October 21, 1997).

<sup>4</sup> See: *In re Application of G*, 11 USPQ2d 1378, 1380 (Comm'r Pats. 1989).

<sup>5</sup> See: *Diligence in Filing Petitions to Revive and Petitions to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment*, 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 33 (March 19, 1991). It was and is Petitioner's burden to exercise diligence in seeking either to have the holding of abandonment withdrawn or the application revived. See 1124 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office *supra*.

<sup>6</sup> Therefore, by example, an unintentional delay in the reply might occur if the reply and transmittal form are to be prepared for shipment by the US Postal Service, but other pressing matters distract one's attention and the mail is not timely deposited for shipment.

CONCLUSION

The petition as considered under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **dismissed**.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:<sup>7</sup>

By mail: Commissioner for Patents<sup>8</sup>  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By FAX: IFW Formal Filings  
(571) 273-8300  
ATTN.: Office of Petitions

By hand: Mail Stop: Petition  
Customer Service Window  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3214.



John J. Gillon, Jr.  
Senior Attorney  
Office of Petitions

---

<sup>7</sup> On July 15, 2005, the Central Facsimile (FAX) Number changed to (571) 273-8300. The old FAX number no longer is in service and (571) 273-8300 will be the only facsimile number recognized for centralized delivery. (For further information. see: <http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/preognotice/cfax062005.pdf>.)

<sup>8</sup> To determine the appropriate addresses for other subject-specific correspondence, refer to the USPTO Web site at [www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov).